

Appl. No. 09/805,811
Amdt. dated November 3, 2003
Reply to Office action of May 2, 2003

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 1-5 are present in the application. No claims are amended herein.

The Examiner objects to the specification, alleging that the terms "prescribed" and "measurement" are unclear, inexact or verbose.

Applicant respectfully traverses. It is respectfully submitted that these terms are well know and would be understood by those of ordinary skill in the art, especially with respect to the term "measurement". Those of ordinary skill in the art to which the application is directed would understand these term. Applicant is uncertain why the Examiner would make this objection.

These terms are clear and would be well understood by those of skill in the art.

Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner makes the same objection with respect to the term "prescribed" in claims 2-5 as made above with respect to the specification. Applicant respectfully traverses. The meaning is clear, and that the Examiner's objections to the word deal with the

Appl. No. 09/805,811
Amdt. dated November 3, 2003
Reply to Office action of May 2, 2003

broadness of the claim, not whether it is indefinite, and it is perfectly acceptable to use the term within the claims.

Claims 1-5 are rejected as being obvious in view of Ohara (U.S. Patent 5,978,573) in view of Hendricks (U.S. 4,785,235). In the previous office action, the Examiner rejected the claims as anticipated by Ohara. Now, the Examiner is combining Hendricks to modify Ohara to allege that the combination would make the invention obvious.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. It is not a valid combination that the Examiner is making, since Hendricks is concerned with testing for shorts. It is not related to testing a semiconductor device. Also, Ohara is concerned with logic circuit design methods for designing low-power semiconductor integrated circuit devices with no increase in the delay time of critical paths contained in combinational circuits of a semiconductor integrated circuit. Ohara is unrelated to what applicant's invention addresses.

The cited documents which the Examiner is relying on are not related to what the applicant is doing with the claimed invention.

Further, Ohara's Fig. 20 clearly shows the difference from present invention. In the Ohara binary search, steps S18 to S27 are shown but error detection is not included through S18 to S27. This is because, the assumption is made that there is no error. If errors are there, it is required in S3 that the HDL

Appl. No. 09/805,811
Amdt. dated November 3, 2003
Reply to Office action of May 2, 2003

is modified, or a functional design process is performed again.
(Ohara 11th column line 40 - line 46) It is equated with the
conventional process procedure shown in Fig. 5 of present
application.

As shown in Fig. 2, the present invention can skip the
error processing, and accordingly, the number of the tests can
be reduced, to a minimum.

Still further, what is taught by Hendricks relates to
efficiency of the test that includes capacitance or inductance,
and it is for performing open/short tests efficiently. It is
neither for eliminating the open/short tests nor for detecting
the pass/fail boundary value. When a loop by 424 to 427 in
Hendricks's Fig. 4A is repeated (the determination in 424
diverges to Y), if the determination in 424 diverges to N, the
measure in 427 resulted to be performed in vain. This shows
that it is impossible to reduce numbers of tests by Hendricks.

The present invention can eliminate the useless tests and
reduce the numbers of tests to a minimum. As shown in Figs. 2
and 3, it is apparent that there is no useless test in the
present invention.

As described above, applicant respectfully believes the
present invention differs from Ohara. In claim 2 of the present
invention, it is important to increase an initial test range for
pass/fail value rather than the setting of the pass/fail value.


Appl. No. 09/805,811
Amdt. dated November 3, 2003
Reply to Office action of May 2, 2003

Ohara' s teachings (16th column, line 39 - line 42) doesn't include what is equivalent to the measurement resolution. Additionally, as shown by Figs. 28(a) to 8(c), Ohara discloses adders that are not related to the measurement resolution.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination neither teaches nor suggests applicant's claimed invention.

In light of the above noted remarks, this application is believed in condition for allowance and notice thereof is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is asked to contact applicant's attorney at 503-224-0115 if there are any questions.

Respectfully submitted,


James H. Walters, Reg. No. 35,731

Customer number 802
DELLETT AND WALTERS
Suite 1101
310 S.W. Fourth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204 US
(503) 224-0115
DOCKET: A-392

Certification of Facsimile Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on this 3rd day of November, 2003.